

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/780,367	JAIN, ANUJ	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dov Popovici	2625	

All Participants:

(1) Dov Popovici

(2) Andrew J. Lee (Reg. No. 60,371)

Date of Interview: 24 November 2009

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

35 USC 102(e)

Claims discussed:

Claims 1, 10, 18 and 28

Prior art documents discussed:

McAfee et al. (US 2003/0206312 A1)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: Response to Non-Final

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 1:31 P.M.

/Dov Popovici/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2625

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed the prior art document, McAfee et al. (US 2003/0206312 A1), which discloses that the print job is sent to that remote printer. The remote printer can be accessed via a location identifier (e.g., IP address, URL), while the claims (for example, claim 1) is directed to determining, by said computer system, a geographic location of said computer system, determining, by said computer system, a geographic location of said electronic device; determining, by said computer system, if said geographic location of said computer system is remote to said geographic location of said electronic device; and if said geographic location of said computer system is remote to said geographic location of said electronic device, preventing, by said computer system, output of said information to said electronic device, as recited in claim 1. Discussed that the geographic location is provided by the location-determining device, such as, from a GPS (see page 11 of the specification). Discussed the computer-readable medium which is disclosed on pages 8-9 in the specification. Finally, discussed an examiner's amendment in order to clarify the claims. In claim 1, line 2, "." is changed to --,-- and in claim 13, line 1, "further" is deleted (see the attached examiner's amendment for more specific details).